

# **Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)**

## **Steering Committee Meeting**

September 21, 2007, 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Resources Agency Bldg., Room 1131

### **Draft Meeting Notes**

#### **Associated documents/handouts:**

- Agenda
- Steering Committee (SC) 07/18/07 Draft meeting notes
- SC 07/27/07 Draft meeting notes

#### **Action Items and Key Decisions**

- SAIC team will hold several follow-up technical sessions for SC members to ask detailed questions about the evaluation process. They will have a CD available with the full report for each member.
- SAIC team may add a brief section to the evaluation on the overall feasibility for each Option to meet planning goals and objectives.

#### **Updates**

- BDCP presented the Conservation Strategy Options Evaluation and general description of BDCP process at Delta Blue Ribbon Task Force
- Independent science workshop was held 9/12-9/14 at the Ryde Hotel. It was reported that SC members gave succinct, direct comments at the workshop.
- Delta Vision is holding regular meetings to develop their recommended strategy. BDCP will check in again with that group in November to ensure alignment.

#### **Conservation Strategy Options Evaluation- Review**

Karen Scarborough gave an introduction to the evaluation presentation, noting that the information in the report will be used in the coming months to identify a single, flexible approach that will be described in a Framework report and carried forward into the conservation planning process.

Pete Rawlings, Paul Cylinder, and Chuck Hanson presented analytical process and key results of the Options Evaluation.

SC members and the SAIC team defined in advance of the evaluation the operational assumptions in the hydrologic models for the four conveyance options. The SAIC team then determined what would be the logical placement for habitat restoration/improvement, given those parameters. The performance of the Options relative to the biological criteria was evaluated by species. The relative ability of each Option to address the important stressors identified for each species was evaluated based on the habitat restoration potential under and hydrodynamic modeling results for each Option. Non-biological criteria were evaluated separately for each of the Options.

Feedback and discussion from SC members was positive with respect to the thoroughness and content of the report, and the SC indicated they are ready to begin considering the Options. They requested an additional brief evaluation of each of the Options with respect to the planning goals. The SAIC technical team will meet with members who have additional technical questions in the coming week.

Fisheries Agencies are doing an analysis of the evaluation to determine if any additional information will be necessary for the next round of decision-making. This evaluation was an appraisal-level analysis, and the next round will be feasibility-level.

NGO members are discussing a hybrid Conservation Strategy Option and may be ready at the next SC meeting to propose it.

### **Public Comment**

Barbara Byrne. Planning and Conservation League. She noted that the report included qualitative and quantitative ranking. “Is the Option the best of the current Options?” is an important question but also, “Does the Option meet the goals?” She notes that for salmonids the best ranked Option includes adverse water quality effects relative to other Options.. Also there is a threshold issue: if flow doesn’t work then restoration can’t be effective. Also, source control assumption is important.

Jonas Minton. Planning and Conservation League. USBR pump project is a potential example project for optimizing the Options. In that case, to advance to the next level people had to understand ecosystem function and specific conveyance and operations. He wants to see optimized strategy soon.

David Bolin. ACWA. Tim Quinn (former BDCP representative) sends compliments on evaluation. With respect to isolated system in Option 4, ACWA was surprised that it was evaluated as the best option for many of the biological criteria. It looks like that is due to assumptions about the operations. Since each of the Options has a range of parameters, the assumption at ACWA is that it would be operated for the maximum biological benefit. Also, on South Delta intake, that project could happen quickly, and there may be advantages to moving quickly with interim solutions and later implementation of long-term solutions. Phasing possibilities: some actions could be taken sooner that are less ideal but the Option could be optimized over time.

### **Meeting attendees**

#### *Representatives*

Karen Scarborough (The Resource Agency)  
Paul Cylinder (SAIC)  
Pete Rawlings (SAIC)  
John McCamman (DFG)  
Ted Meyers (DFG)  
John Engbring (USFWS)  
Barbara McDonnell (USBR)  
Tracy Ligon (Santa Clara Valley Water District)  
Greg Gartrell (CCWD)  
Kim Delfino (Defenders of Wildlife)  
Gary Bobker (The Bay Institute)

Anthony Saracino (TNC)  
Richard Roos-Collins (American Rivers, NHI)  
Greg Thomas (NHI)  
Sue Ramos (Westlands)  
Tom Howard (SWRCB)  
Jeffrey Russell (Mirant)  
Frank Michny (USBR)  
Joe Grindstaff (CBDA)  
Ara Azhderrian (SLDM)  
Roger Patterson (MWD)  
Kenny Watkins (CFBF)  
Marc Ebbin (The Resources Agency/DWR)  
Will Stelle (The Resources Agency)  
Laura King Moon (State Water Contractors)

#### *By phone*

Bill Boyd  
Ann Hayden  
Dale Myers